REMARKS

The Office Action dated July 2, 2004, has been carefully considered. In response thereto, the present application has been amended in a manner that is believed to place it into condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding Office Action and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Summary of the Office Action

In the present Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification because the Examiner contends that the disclosure does not support the term "runner," as recited in claim 25. In addition, the Examiner has rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as not being enabled.

Claims 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, and 24-28 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, and 11-17 of co-pending U.S. Patent Appl. Serial No. 10/416,818. Claims 17-19 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being upatentable over claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, and 11-17 of co-pending U.S. Patent Appl. Serial No. 10/416,818 in view of Great Britain patent publication GB 201,645 to *Gilbey-Thompson*. Finally, claims 22 and 23 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being upatentable over claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, and 11-17 of co-pending U.S. Patent Appl. Serial No. 10/416,818 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,027,958 to *Agardi*.

As discussed below, Applicant has addressed each of those objections and rejections.

Specification Objections:

The Examiner objected to the specification because the Examiner contends that the disclosure does not support the term "runner," as recited in claim 25. Claim 25 is being cancelled herewith. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph:

The Examiner has rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as not being enabled. As noted above, claim 25 is being cancelled herewith. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under § 112, first paragraph, is requested.

Claim Rejection – Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

Claims 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, and 24-28 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, and 11-17 of co-pending U.S. Patent Appl. Serial No. 10/416,818. Claims 17-19 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being upatentable over claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, and 11-17 of co-pending U.S. Patent Appl. Serial No. 10/416,818 in view of Great Britain patent publication GB 201,645 to *Gilbey-Thompson*. Finally, claims 22 and 23 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being upatentable over claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, and 11-17 of co-pending U.S. Patent Appl. Serial No. 10/416,818 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,027,958 to *Agardi*. For the reasons noted below, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of those claims.

Applicant is submitting herewith a terminal disclaimer, which is intended to serve the statutory function of removing the rejection of double patenting. Applicant wishes to note that the filing of the terminal disclaimer does not raise any presumptions or act as an estoppel concerning the merits of the double patenting rejection. See M.P.E.P. § 804.02. Applicant also wishes to note that the term of the present application, assuming the term is not adjusted due to prosecution delays on the part of the PTO, will naturally expire before the co-pending application.

Accordingly, because the terminal disclaimer removes the co-pending application as prior art, Applicant submits that there is no basis for the present double-patenting rejection. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness-type double patenting rejections is respectfully requested.